DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 335 333 SP 033 222

AUTHOR Bartell, Carol A.; Wagner, Laura A.
TITLE Teacher Induction as a State Reform Issue.
PUB DATE Apr 91
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, April 3-7, 1991).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Teacher Induction; *Educational Assessment; Educational Certificates; Educational Change; Educational Finance; *Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Social Support Groups; Staff Development; State Departments of Education; State Legislation; *Teacher Improvement; Teaching Models
IDENTIFIERS California; *California New Teacher Project; *Policy Implementation

ABSTRACT

States have enacted a variety of far-reaching educational reforms in recent years which have focused on a mix of standards for improved programs and greater accountability for both students and teachers. In California, teacher professionalism reforms, including induction reform, have been introduced. Research, now in its third and final year, has yielded a good deal of information with respect to new teacher assessment and support issues and has recognized the complexity of teaching as well as a variety of appropriate approaches to prepare teachers better to meet classroom responsibilities. Some initial policy directions have already been established by the California New Teacher Project: general agreement that new teachers need support; when given the opportunity to develop unique approaches to new teacher support, most plans employ remarkably similar delivery models; new teacher support makes a difference in inner city and urban settings; the learning that occurs is reciprocal; universities can play an important role; and resources of both time and money are required. In the third and final year of research, there is a great deal more knowledge about new teacher assessment and support issues, but more uncertainty regarding the political will and capacity for change. (LL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 336333

Teacher Induction as a State Reform Issue

Carol A. Bartell, Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Laura A. Wagner, California Department of Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. Bartell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois, April, 1991.

Opinions expressed in this paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing or the California Department of Education.

SP 033 222

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Teacher Induction as a State Reform Issue

Carol A. Bartell
Laura A. Wagner

Introduction: State Reform

States have enacted a variety of far-reaching educational reforms in recent years (Murphy, 1982; Odden & Marsh, 1989; Wirt & Kirst, 1989). Given impetus by a variety of reports calling for substantive change (Boyer, 1983; National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983; Holmes Group, 1986), reforms have focused on a mix of standards for improved programs and greater accountability for both students and teachers.

States have always had a strong interest in education because of the state responsibility for the provision of education to its citizens as provided for in each of the 50 state constitutions. However, until recent years, much of the authority held by the states has been delegated to local school boards. The shift to stronger state involvement in education has been documented by policy analysts. Wirt and Kirst (1989) argue that the following developments have combined to bring about an increased state role in educational policy setting:

- Most state legislatures have added staff and research capacity and meet for longer periods of time than in the past.

- After an initial period of federal expansion into educational matters, federal activity has declined in recent years. This has left the state with more control over the spending of federal monies. It has also left a vacuum in policy agenda setting which has been filled in a more vigorous way by the states.

- Local interest groups who have long dominated educational decision-making have failed to reach agreement and have often become pitted against one another. This has increased confusion and, in some quarters, decreased respect for traditional supporters of local control.

- Key structural changes in the growth and diversification of state tax sources have developed, providing states with the ability and resources to fund reform measures and limiting local capacity to do so.

Many states have used this new capacity to direct reform efforts to the nature and quality of the teaching force. Such policy direction came about from the call to "professionalize" teaching (Wise, 1990) and "restructure" schools and the conditions under which teaching occurs (Elmore et al., 1990).

State legislatures and education agencies have especially demonstrated their commitment to the preparation, induction, professional development, and retention of a high quality teaching force. Many states have designed incentive systems intended to change the roles, responsibilities, and reward systems of teachers (Bartell, 1987). Though state-wide programs vary in their intentions, rationales, activities, and outcomes, they are all concerned with improving the professional conditions under which teachers work and enhancing the performance of teachers in the classroom.

Among the reform measures directed toward professionalizing the teacher workforce, special attention has been paid to new teachers. This is not surprising, given the potential for state level impact on teacher preparation programs, the licensure process, and for targeting support efforts in schools through state funding mechanisms. The attention to beginning teachers also represents the realization that it is crucial to provide a good beginning experience in order to promote teacher effectiveness and retention.

This paper will describe current new teacher induction reform efforts in California. These efforts will be discussed in relationship to some national trends in teacher induction. The development of and ongoing research on an extensive, three-year pilot study known as the California New Teacher Project (CNTP) will be described and set into the larger state policy context. Finally, the major policy issues which are emerging from the research on the California New Teacher Project will be addressed.

A Model of Teacher Development for California

The State of California has an interest in assuring that teachers are well-prepared to enter classrooms and to assume responsibility for student learning. But that interest in the quality of teaching does not end once teachers are prepared to begin teaching. Given the steady exit of many new teachers from the classroom, the state also has an interest in seeing that highly-qualified, well-prepared new teachers remain in teaching and that they continue to grow as they practice their profession.

We know that a teacher does not learn everything he or she needs to know about teaching during the pre-service preparation program (Carter et al, 1988; Feiman-Nemser 1983; Little, 1989; Shulman, 1986) and that the expert teacher looks and behaves differently than the novice (Berliner, 1986; Borko & Livingston, 1989) and that the concerns of teachers are different at different stages of their careers (Veenam, 1984; Zeichner, 1983). Induction programs

should identify these differences and build upon the needs of teachers at different stages of their careers.

Any plan for new teacher induction needs to view the induction period as one part of the overall career development of a teacher. Huling-Austin recognizes the "need to operationalize induction programs that function both as a logical extension to the pre-service teacher-training program and an entry piece to a larger career-long professional development program for teachers" (1990, p. 545). The continuum of professional growth that begins with the foundation of a pre-service preparation program is extended into the initial years of teaching when the beginning teacher first begins to apply what has been learned, and is built upon as the teacher continues to learn, grow, and develop throughout a professional career.

This view of the teaching profession will continue to guide the development efforts in induction as well as the other stages of the teacher's professional career.

Teacher Induction on the National Agenda

Most professions provide for a gradual introduction to the responsibilities of the position and access to experienced colleagues for advice and assistance as needed. But this is not the case in education, where new teachers have typically assumed the same kind of responsibilities as their more experienced colleagues from the first day on the job and where they work in settings that isolate them from their colleagues.

This initial introduction of the novice teacher to the norms and responsibilities of the profession is a crucial period that is too important to ignore. A better transition from "student of teaching to teacher" (Griffin et al., 1983) is needed. It is during this period that many choose to leave the profession (Darling-Hammond, 1984; Schlechty & Vance, 1983), some because of an unsuccessful experience in an unsupportive environment. Houston and Felder (1982) recognize that "teachers must be inducted into the profession humanely, in ways that engender pride, openness, and increased professional competence and stature" (p. 460).

It has also been suggested that the stature of a profession depends in part on the extent to which it verifies the professional knowledge and competence of each member in a broad assessment that must be passed in order to practice the profession (Holmes Group, 1988; Shulman, 1987). Teacher accountability is considered to be one part of the professionalization of teaching (Wise, 1990). The question to be asked is how and at what point(s) in the teacher's career should assessment occur? The induction period represents one potential point for such assessment.

This two-pronged approach to teacher induction, support and assessment, has formed the basis of many emerging state plans designed to facilitate entry into the profession and assure a well-prepared, high quality workforce (Wagner, 1990). Both play prominently in the California plan for teacher induction as well.

While few formal, systematic induction programs existed before the 1980's, there has long been a concern among educators about this initial period of professional practice. Most induction programs that did exist were initiated by local schools or districts for teachers new to their systems. One early forerunner of current induction programs was a three-year experimental demonstration project on the Induction of Beginning Teachers sponsored by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (Swanson, 1968).

During the 1980's, interest in teacher induction grew dramatically. Florida was the first state to mandate a state-wide teacher induction program in the early 1980's. By the late 1980's, at least 31 states, including California, had implemented or were piloting teacher induction programs (Hawk & Robards, 1987). Huling-Austin (1990) points out that the educational literature and programs of professional educational organization meetings in the 1980's reflected the increased attention given to the topic of teacher induction during this decade.

Because most of the developments in teacher induction are so recent, it is difficult to obtain up-to-date information about the number and extent of state-wide programs. Even less is known about the impacts of those programs that do exist. Four recent national surveys (Eastern Illinois University, 1986; Hawk & Robards, 1987; Mastain, 1988; Neuweiler, 1987) provide some information about the extent of interest in state-wide induction programs. The Illinois study (Eastern Illinois University, 1986) reported that 17 states had induction programs in the piloting or implementation stages, 14 had programs in the study/planning/development stage, and 20 states had no programs or no planning for such programs. The Neuweiler report (1987) indicates that only three states report no state interest in teacher induction programs. Of the states reporting fully operational programs, virtually all were established by state legislation or state agency regulation. Twelve states report that their programs are linked to certification (Mastain, 1988).

Teacher Induction in California

The California New Teacher Project (CNTP) was initiated and funded by the California Legislature in the Teacher Credentialing Law of 1988 (Chapter 1355 of the Statutes of 1988). The CNTP is jointly administered by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) and the California Department of Education (CDE).

The CNTP is funding pilot projects to explore innovative ways of supporting and assessing new teachers. The two administrative agencies (CTC and CDE) are responsible for providing recommendations to the Legislature in March, 1992 regarding the need for new state policies for beginning teacher licensure and support services during induction. The project is currently in its third year of operation and thirty-seven local pilot projects are funded in urban, metropolitan, suburban, and rural districts throughout the state. Approximately 3000 first and second year teachers have participated in the projects since its inception. Projects were selected for funding on a competitive basis to represent a variety of approaches, structures, and delivery models for new teacher support.

The Bergeson Act (S.B. 148) specifically requires that each alternative method of support and assessment be evaluated along the following dimensions:

- effectiveness at improving the pedagogical content knowledge and skills of the beginning teacher who are retained;

- effectiveness at improving the ability of beginning teachers to teach students who are ethnically, culturally, economically, academically, and linguistically diverse;

- effectiveness at identifying beginning teachers who need additional assistance and, if that additional assistance fails, who should be removed from the educational profession;

- the relative costs of the method in relation to its beneficial effects; and

- the extent to which an alternative method of supporting or assessing beginning teachers would, if it were added to the other state requirements for teaching credentials, make careers in education more of less appealing to prospective teachers.

Extensive research is being undertaken on the support and assessment approaches being tested in the California New Teacher Project. The evaluation of the support mechanisms used in these projects is being conducted by the Southwest Regional Educational Laboratory (SWRL). Far West Laboratory (FWL) is pilot testing innovative forms of new teacher assessment. The findings from the research conducted by these external reviewers will form the basis of recommendations to the Legislature in March of 1992. These recommendations will suggest policies that should govern the direction of support and assessment of beginning teachers as a

condition for the professional certification and staff development of those teachers in the future (Education Code: 44279.2, 1988).

Several important factors need to be considered in the examination of this work. First, it is a research and development effort. Unlike other state-wide initiatives, the legislative directive was to study the issues rather than to implement a full state-wide plan. Second, the initiative itself was the product of several years of less formal research and development work by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, the Department of Education, and various school districts and universities to provide greater connections between pre-service preparation and new teacher induction into the classroom. Third, there is a lack of consensus about the extent to which state-wide policy should and can promote teacher professionalism. This suggests that any new policy proposal will need to reflect coalition support for any further initiatives.

Background: California Attention to Teacher Professionalism

SB 148 was the consensus version of several teacher policy initiatives mounted in the State Legislature in the late 1980's. However, the idea of providing resources and direction for teacher induction was not a new one for either the Commission on Teacher Credentialing or the California Department of Education.

The Commission first gave attention to the beginning years of teaching when it embarked on a complex research project known as the Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study (BTES). This six year study, spanning from 1972-1978, was planned to fulfill two purposes: the identification of generic teacher competencies and the evaluation of teacher education programs through a follow-up of graduates of those programs. However, as work progressed the program evaluation component was left to another effort, and the focus of BTES changed to that of identification of teaching skills and their impact on student outcomes. By the third year of fieldwork, the identification of teaching skills was expanded to include other goals: fostering research on teaching and teacher education, enhancing communication between researchers and educators, and modeling effective interagency cooperation. (Denham & Lieberman, 1980).

Informed in part by this study, in 1979 the Commission on Teacher Credentialing established a Task Force on the Beginning Years of Teaching and began discussions of how to bridge initial preparation with practice and the implications of this introductory period of teaching for the credentialing process. Early discussions centered on an initial trial period that might serve as a residency before the granting of a full, professional level credential.

This idea of a residency period appeared again in a report issued in 1985 by the California Commission on the Teaching Profession entitled Who Will Teach our Children? This report, developed by a coalition of business, legislative and educational leaders, called for structural changes in teacher preparation, licensure, induction, evaluation, career opportunities and working conditions in order to help teachers to become more successful with the changing, rapidly growing student population in California. Along with recommendations for a beginning residency period or internship for new teachers was a call for a stronger assessment of their performance. It was suggested that individual teacher candidates demonstrate their readiness to teach through a candidate-based assessment system.

Since 1985, several reform efforts have been undertaken by both the CTC and the CDE which have been devoted to the successful resolution of issues related to both the comprehensive support and assessment of beginning teachers. One area under review has been current assessment measures employed with beginning teachers in California.

Currently, beginning teachers in California are required to demonstrate proficiency in basic skills and appropriate subject matter before completion of their professional preparation program of studies. Assessments in both areas continue to be reviewed.

A recent careful examination of the content of the subject matter exams--the NTE Core Battery and the NTE Speciality Area Tests--revealed that they were not in alignment with either the current preparation programs in the universities or with the curriculum that teachers were expected to deliver. Nor was the format, the traditional multiple choice approach, conducive to measuring the complex reasoning skills required of teachers. Revisions are now taking place in order to remedy those problems. California is working to develop more authentic performance assessments of teacher subject matter knowledge and pedagogical skill.

The California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST) is not meant to measure teaching ability, but is designed to measure basic reading, math, and writing skills. All potential teachers are required to demonstrate these basic competencies before they are permitted to student teach. The CTC has initiated several studies to investigate why this test continues to be difficult for disproportionate numbers of minority examinees.

Revisions have also taken place in the professional preparation portion of the teacher's initial introduction to teaching. The Commission on Teacher Credentialing has initiated a redesign of the program approval and evaluation process for colleges and universities offering programs for prospective teachers. At the heart of the plan adopted in 1986 is a set of program standards developed, with a great deal of input from the field, for

each professional preparation program. The Commission determines whether a program satisfies a standard on the basis of a consideration by an evaluation team, consisting of trained educators, of all available information related to the standard. These revisions have moved the Commission away from a narrow, compliance-oriented approach to program approval and evaluation, to a a system designed to incorporate a great deal of peer-review and professional judgement regarding the quality of professional preparation programs.

Among the standards that have been developed and are now used for initial program approval and later program evaluation are those for the basic multiple and single subject (elementary and secondary) teaching credential in California. However, these standards apply to the professional or pedagogical portion of the preparation program only. The next step being undertaken is the development of program standards and a review process for the content and substance of the subject matter preparation program for multiple and single subject teachers, known as "waiver programs" because candidates completing these approved programs are allowed to waive the NTE subject matter exam.

From a staff development perspective, in 1986 the Department of Education and the California State University (CSU) Chancellor's Office began exploring ways to support new teachers in inner city settings. The Inner City New Teacher Retention Projects began in 1986-87 under the sponsorship of the Department and the CSU Chancellor's Office with the purpose of increasing the retention of teacher who begin their careers in urban schools with high concentrations of low-achieving students. The five funded projects were brought under the CNTP umbrella in 1990-91 when they lost the CSU portion of their funding due to budget reductions. These projects have already contributed to the CNTP research effort, particularly to the effort to discern effective teaching strategies for diverse students in California schools. Teachers in the Inner City New Teacher Retention Projects demonstrated higher-than-average retention rates, were more positive about their success as teachers and teaching as their chosen profession than new teachers across the nation, and were able to successfully demonstrate a wider range of effective instructional practices (Ward & Broekhuizen, 1991).

Staff development for new and experienced teachers is an area that has undergone considerable change in recent years, in California as well as nation-wide. As the curriculum becomes less skills-driven, students are expected to apply knowledge and skill in problem-solving situations. Teachers need to acquire this same ability and need to be prepared to help students in a different way. To promote improvements in delivery of the curriculum and assessment of students, a number of states and institutions of higher education are rethinking how professional development for classroom teachers occurs. Rather than expecting teachers to strengthen their

own knowledge and skill in short, one-shot workshops, energy is increasingly being put into longer term training, which is followed-up and supported at the school level.

This approach to staff development has taken different forms in different districts. Two major approaches have emerged. The first is the intensive curriculum institute providing opportunities for teachers to review the contents of new curricula in research-based, intensive settings, which are followed by local support services conducted by fellow teachers (Joyce & Showers, 1988)). In the second approach, master or mentor teachers who are based at the district or school level provide implementation support, much as a "classroom coach" (Wagner, 1987). Both of these approaches rely heavily on the expertise of the best classroom teachers.

To support the overall direction of improvement of teachers' subject-specific pedagogical expertise, SB 1882 (Morgan, 1988) provides funds for: a) Seven Subject Matter Projects, based in universities, b) regional centers to coordinate staff development in the schools, and c) school level funding to connect staff development to school improvement plans.

A large part of new teacher support in the New Teacher Project comes from an experienced teacher who provides emotional support and professional guidance. These activities have been enhanced by support from the Mentor Teacher Program. Initiated in the omnibus educational reform package (SB 813, 1983), the Mentor Teacher Program is intended to encourage and reward exemplary teachers. A primary function of their role is to provide assistance and guidance to new teachers (California Education Code, Section 44496). They also work in curriculum development and staff development for all teachers. As the program has evolved, new teacher support has assumed an increasingly prominent focus. In fact, forty percent of those who support CNTP new teachers are district-designated Mentor Teachers.

The CTC has also concerned itself with the staff development portion of the continuing education of teachers. It is no longer assumed that an educator's professional development should be unplanned or discretionary. Renewal requirements for the multiple and single subject credentials (with other credential renewal requirements to follow) have been adopted in order to encourage teachers to pursue a wide variety of responsible, effective activities in behalf of their own professional development. At five-year intervals, credential holders complete a planned sequence of professional growth activities consisting of 150 clock hours and verify at least one-half year of service in the credential area. A wide variety of acceptable activities were defined in the belief that state policies should not preclude the pursuit of legitimate growth activities for professional educators. New teachers in California now enter the profession with the clear understanding and expectation that they will continue to grow and develop as they practice their

profession. Credentialing requirements now span from the entry level, or Provisional Credential, to the Professional Level at the completion of a full professional preparation program, to the ongoing growth and renewal stage. What has been missing is a comprehensive plan for the induction stage. It is that piece of the credential structure which is being addressed in the CNTP.

A Shifting Policy Arena

The California New Teacher Project was developed in the context of the reform climate described above, influenced by both a national and state reform agenda. However, that context is one that is constantly shifting and changing.

A number of factors have contributed to recent changes in the policy environment in California. The passage of Proposition 98 in 1988, heralded by the education community as a reform that would provide a guaranteed level of funding, or a "floor" beneath which funding levels would not fall, quickly became interpreted as a "ceiling" amount to be allocated to education from the general fund. Because the state faces a $12.5 billion budget deficit in 1991-92, the Governor's current budget proposes suspension of Proposition 98, cutting substantially into reform efforts. In addition, the Mentor Teacher Program is facing suspension, and plans to extend the support offered in the California New Teacher Project for one additional year have been rejected. Deep cuts are anticipated in local school district budgets as well; an estimated 10,000 teachers across the state have already been sent lay-off notices (Lambert, 1991). Many of these notices have been sent to new teachers--some of whom are the very teachers the CNTP has been working so hard to retain. It should be noted that because the Legislature has not yet voted on a budget package, there is a possibility that some funding may be restored.

Another change that has yet to be assessed for its impact is the changing face of the Legislature and the legislative staff. Proposition 140, imposing term limits on state legislators as well as reduction in funding for legislative staff has had an immediate effect in Sacramento. Many experienced staff members who were well-versed on educational policy issues have already departed for more secure employment opportunities. Fewer staff with background in the policy issues will be available to work on Legislative policy. Further, the newer, more junior members who eventually take their places will have little sense of the history of an issue or of the intent of past legislative initiatives.

State college and university budgets have been cut as well. Thus their likely participation in bridging teaching preparation with teacher practice in an induction period is lessened. They also appear less willing to spend resources developing the new courses and programs called for in other reform efforts

designed to improve both the subject matter and professional preparation of teachers.

It is against this backdrop that the California New Teacher Project is planning to move from a large research and evaluation project to recommendations for possible state-wide implementation.

From Pilot to Implementation

Because state-wide teacher induction programs are so new, there is little research about the long term benefits of such programs and the states' ability to sustain these programs, especially in a changing policy arena. However, research on the implementation of other reform efforts may provide some direction. A variety of studies point out that the local organizational context plays a large part in determining the success of planned change efforts, whether they are initiated at the federal, state, or local level. Local capacity and political will are essential in generating substantive responses to state incentives and proposed policy changes (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978; Corbett, Dawson, & Firestone, 1984; Lipsky, 1980; Milstein, 1980; McLaughlin, 1990).

Elmore (1980) has written about policy that does not achieve its intended purpose or that merely assures some minimal paper compliance without producing real change. Such policy often results in unintended consequences that tend to undermine the real intent of the framers of that policy, thus failing to address the need that the policy addresses. He suggests that policy, in order to achieve its intended results, needs to be "capacity enhancing" rather than "compliance effecting." In other words, such policy needs to be designed to facilitate the ability of the implementors to carry out the policy in ways that are viewed as beneficial and worthwhile to the organization.

Elmore and McLaughlin (1982) point out that most policies contain some mix of compliance and assistance strategies. "Compliance strategies stress clarity, uniformity, and consistency of sanctions and certainty of reprisal for noncompliance. Assistance strategies stress deference to state and local authority and variability of state and local conditions" (p. 160). They go on to describe the paradox of policy implementation: "policies cannot succeed unless individuals and organizations take responsibility for their success, but if they had assumed that responsibility to begin with it may not have been necessary to have a policy" (p.175).

It is this failure to find an appropriate balance between compliance and assistance that doom many reform measures. Teacher induction planning has not escaped this dilemma. Instead of professionalizing teaching, some plans may have worsened the professional life of the teacher by prescribing some "ideal" model against which all teachers are compared. In fact, some

persons feel that state-mandated teacher induction programs have tended to standardize teaching behaviors and discourage reflective, creative teaching (Borko, 1986; Darling-Hammond, 1989). Frymier (1987) speaks of policy-making that is intended to assist teachers but that actually tends to "undercut teachers by creating conditions of work that blunt teachers' enthusiasm and stifle teachers' creativity" (p. 1). He refers to this as the "neutering" of teachers.

California has sought to avoid the restrictive nature of a mere compliance-oriented policy and has sought to build upon local capacity and will to implement effective programs. The premise upon which the state initiative for new teacher induction is built is that guidance and assistance should be an integral part of a broad state policy to support teacher quality, and of local strategies for staff development. State guidelines provide for a broad range of local implementation strategies. It is a blend of state direction and support and local initiative and development. Virtually all pilot projects have connected new teacher support to other initiatives (Mentor Teacher, staff development) and projects are encouraged to work collaboratively across programs rather than function as an isolated categorical program.

The development of assessment prototypes for new teachers has also faced similar concerns in that the state is seeking to define assessment measures that would recognize the complexity of teaching. While a variety of performance-based teacher assessments have been developed in recent years, including a number of observation instruments which have been adopted as teacher credentialing requirements in other states, many of these instruments are very prescriptive in terms of teaching styles (Estes, et al, 1991). An assessment system for California would measure the ability of teachers to teach a wide variety of students in many contexts. Therefore, the state is developing and Far West Laboratory (FWL) is pilot testing a range of approaches to teacher assessment which include classroom observations, oral interviews, videotaped scenarios, portfolios, and technologically-based exercises.

While much is being learned about new teacher support and assessment in California, important questions remain. How does a state assure compliance within broad state guidelines while avoiding a top-down model and imposing a prescriptive framework for new teacher growth and development? How does a teacher induction program respond to the needs of individual teachers in a variety of settings yet assure that a high quality support programs are in place state-wide? What can be done to encourage more students from under-represented groups (i.e. Hispanics and African-American) to consider careers in teaching? How shall the overall performance of teachers be assessed? What should be the relationship between new teacher support and assessment within a state framework? These questions raise important policy issues for consideration and continue

to be addressed in various ways throughout the life of the pilot project. They are at the heart of what will be considered as we move from pilot projects to recommendations for possible state-wide implementation.

Policy Directions

California is moving toward the design of a support system and assessment system for new teachers in the state. A report is due to the Legislature in March of 1992 and will be based on what has been learned from the California New Teacher Project evaluation efforts. Some initial policy directions have already been established, others remain to be resolved before the report is developed.

There is general agreement in California that new teachers need support. In fact, in a state-wide survey of districts in California, virtually all districts reported some level of staff development opportunities available to new teachers (Dianda, et al, 1991). This represents a major shift in the policy environment in the last six years which is in part attributable to the dissemination of information about the CNTP. When new teacher support was first offered in the 1986 CSU/CDE Inner City New Teacher Retention Project, 50 teachers were served in two sites. New teacher support was still a sufficiently novel concept that districts had difficulty identifying eligible new teachers. By contrast, during the past three years, approximately 3000 new teachers in their first and second years of service have been identified and served in 120 school districts under the aegis of the California New Teacher Project. In seeking to find comparison districts for the evaluation study, SWRL, the evaluation contractor for the study, had difficulty finding districts that admitted to providing no support for new teachers. However, it is still unclear whether these districts are providing real or only nominal support to new teachers.

When given the opportunity to develop unique approaches to new teacher support, most plans employ remarkably similar delivery models. Although a variety of governance and organization models for new teacher support were funded, the delivery of support services at the teacher level tends to be remarkably similar. Most teachers receive 1) help from a more experienced colleague in the form of emotional support and professional advice and, 2) some kind of training, through university coursework, or district/school staff development activity. The differences lie in the intensity and in the appropriateness of the support in response to the new teacher needs. Some of the more unique delivery models proposed were perhaps more difficult to implement in a three-year time period. Additionally, districts may have taken a more conservative approach, being reluctant to initiate a new direction or make structural changes that could not been sustained when pilot project funding would be eliminated.

Within project variance in teacher services is greater than across project variance. This finding limits our ability to comment at this time about the efficacy of some delivery models as opposed to others. Although this issue will continue to be explored, it would appear that service received is to a large extent a function of new teacher interest and the project's ability to deliver services consistently, over time, at the individual classroom level. Initial research focused on across project differences. Current research is shifting toward differences across major features that are a part of each of the projects and the relative effectiveness of those particular features in responding to new teacher needs and in producing differential results on the outcome measures.

New teacher support particularly makes a difference in inner city, urban settings. Teacher satisfaction among teachers has been unusually high in urban settings, often considered to present the most difficult challenges for beginning teachers. New teacher retention in district, willingness to continue to teach in hard-to-staff schools, and perceived effectiveness with students are all enhanced through effective support measures.

The learning that occurs through new teacher support is reciprocal. Both new teachers and their support providers grow and develop as a result of their involvement in the project. The collegial interactions among novices and their more experienced support providers fosters collegial interactions that benefit all teachers and add a richer dimension to the life of a school.

Universities can play an important role in new teacher support. This role is most effectively played when faculty members are given resources and organizational recognition for their involvement in new teacher support and when the support offered is considered to be practical and relevant to a new teacher's experience (Ward & Dianda, 1990). It is not enough to rely on the goodwill and commitment of individual faculty members. Interestingly, many of the university project directors in the CNTP are do not fall within the traditional tenure-stream of the academy, but occupy "special assignment" positions. As Goodlad (1990) suggests, we need to make a fundamental shift in "what counts" in the faculty retention, promotion and tenure process.

Support requires resources in the form of time and money. The state is currently spending an average of $3000 per teacher on support and local funds supplement this with approximately $2200 each. Projects are most effectively run when they have a person in place with time fully committed to the project, especially when there are significant numbers of new teachers involved. New teachers and their support providers need time and convenient opportunities to work together if the support is to be meaningful.

Support and Assessment have yet to come together in the CNTP. This phenomena is partly by design. The support component of the project was

kept separate from the assessment efforts, because neither was intended to drive the direction of the other. Teachers were not expected to receive support solely designed to help them "pass" a certain assessment. Nor was the assessment focused on a particular model of support or view of teaching. The research on both support and assessment are expected, however, to inform the decisions that will be made about the model or models of teaching and teacher development that are expected to emerge from this project. This is perhaps the most difficult challenge to be faced in the coming year as we examine the extent to which new teacher support and assessment should be loosely or tightly coupled and try to define policies to guide the direction of a state-wide support and assessment system.

Conclusions

The California teacher professionalism reforms, including the induction reform efforts included in the California New Teacher Project, have been played out on a moving stage. This shifting policy arena includes a changing resource base (both human and fiscal) and changing priorities for the taxpayer's dollar. The result is that as we approach the third and final year of the research, we know a great deal more about new teacher assessment and support issues, but are on less certain ground regarding the political will and capacity for change.

Our vision of a good teacher preparation includes an induction period which offers a combination of support and assessment, and which encourages local capacity building by schools and institutions of higher education within an accountable environment. Induction will continue to be viewed as one part of the overall career development of teachers. Teachers will be supported and assessed in ways that recognize the complexity of teaching and the variety of appropriate approaches to preparing them to meet their responsibilities in the classroom. The balance between candidate accountability and program evaluation will need to be addressed. Part of making a fragmented system more coherent and internally consistent will require that whatever approach is taken addresses a range of policy points with time for organizational phase-in and opportunities for feedback and revisions in the system.

We do know that the California student population is changing rapidly, the needs and problems are becoming more acute, and the demand for a highly skilled, well-qualified teacher workforce will only increase. It has become evident that a well-designed, carefully implemented plan for teacher induction can contribute to this improved workforce. Yet induction is only one part of the total reform effort related to teacher professionalism, and must be viewed in that context. Reform in all areas related to teacher professionalism must continue to be addressed.

REFERENCES

Adams, R.D. (1982). Teacher development: A look at changes in teacher perceptions and behavior across time. Journal of Teacher Education, 33(4), 40-43.

Anderson, E.M. & Shannon, A.L. (1988). Toward a conceptualization of mentoring. Journal of Teacher Education, 39(1), 38-42.

Association of Teacher Educators. (1990). Assisting the beginning teacher. Reston, VA: Author.

Bartell, C.A. (1987). Incentives that enhance the teaching profession: Background paper. Elmhurst, IL: North Central Regional Educational Laboratory.

Berliner, D.C. (1986). In pursuit of the expert pedagogue. Educational Researcher, 15(3), 5-15.

Berman P. & McLaughlin M.W. (1973-1978). Federal programs supporting educational change. (R-1589-HEW). Santa Monica: Rand.

Bird, T., & Little, J.W. (1986). How schools organize the teaching occupation. Elementary School Journal, 86(4), 493-512.

Borko, H. (1986). The induction years. In J. Hoffman & S.A. Edwards (Eds.), Reality and reform in clinical teacher education. New York: Random House.

Borko, H & Livingston, C. (1989). Cognition and improvisation: Differences in mathematics instruction by expert and novice teachers. American Educational Research Journal, 26(4), 473-498.

Boyer, E.L. (1983). High school: A report to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. New York: Harper and Row.

California Commission on the Teaching Profession. (1985). Who will teach our children: A strategy for improving California schools. Sacramento: California Commission on the Teaching Profession.

Carter, K., Sabers, D. Cushing, K., Pinnegar, S., & Berliner, D. (1988). Expert-novice differences in perceiving and processing visual classroom stimuli. Journal of Teacher Education. 39(3), 25-31.

Cochran-Smith, M. & Lytle, S.L. (1990). Research on teaching and teacher research: The issues that divide. Educational Researcher, 19(2), 2-11.

Copeland, W.D. (1986). The RITE framework of teacher education: applications. In J.V. Hoffman, & S.E. Edwards (Ed.). Reality and reform in clinical teacher education. New York: Random House.

Corbett, H.D., Dawson, J.A., & Firestone, W.A. (1984). School context and school change: Implications for effective planning. New York: Teachers College Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1984). Beyond the commission reports: The coming crisis in teaching. Santa Monica, California: The Rand Corporation.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1988). The futures of teaching. Educational Leadership, 46(3), 4-10.

Denham, C., & Lieberman, A. (Eds.). (1980). Time to learn. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education.

Eastern Illinois University. (1986). Final report for initial year of teaching study. Chicago: Illinois State Board of Education.

Elmore, R.F. (1980). Complexity and control: What legislators and administrators can do about implementing public policy. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education.

Elmore, R.F. et al. (1990). Restructuring schools: The next generation of educational reform. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Elmore, R.F. & McLaughlin, M.W. (1982). Strategic choice in federal education policy: The compliance-assistance tradeoff. In A. Lieberman & M.W. McLaughlin (Eds.), Policy making in education. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Elmore, R.F. & McLaughlin, M.W. (1988). Steady work: Policy, practice, and the reform of American Education. Santa Monica: Rand.

Estes, G.D., Stansbury, K., Long, C., & Wolf, K. (1991). Assessment component of the California New Teacher Project. Vol. 1. San Franciso: Far West Laboratory.

Evans, J.W., Wald, M.S., Smrekar, C., Ventresca, M.J. (1989). A sociodemographic portrait. In Policy Analysis for California Education (Ed.), Conditions of children in California. Berkeley: PACE.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (1983). Learning to teach. In L.S. Shulman and G. Sykes (eds.), Handbook of teaching and policy. New York: Longman.

Fox, S.M. & Singletary, T.J. (1986). Deductions about supportive induction. Journal of Teacher Education, 37, (1), 12-15.

Frymier, J. (1987). Bureaucracy and the neutering of teachers. Paper presented at the ASCD Annual Conference, New Orleans.

Goodlad, J.I. (1990). Teachers for our Nation's Schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gray W.A., & Gray, M.M. (1985). Synthesis of research on mentoring beginning teachers. Educational Leadership, 43(3), 37-43.

Griffin, G.A. (1985). Teacher induction research issues. Journal of Teacher Education, 36(1), 42-46.

Griffin, G.A. (1986). Teaching as a profession: The reform agenda for teacher education. Providence, Rhode Island: University of Rhode Island.

Griffin, G.A., Barnes, S., Definio, M., Edwards, S., Hoffman, J.V., Hukill, H., & O'Neal, S. (1983). Teacher induction: Research design for a descriptive study. Austin, TX: University of Texas at Austin.

Guthrie, J.W. (1989). Education. In Policy Analysis for California Education (Ed.), Conditions of children in California. Berkeley: PACE.

Hawk, P. & Robards, S. (1987). Statewide teacher induction programs. In D. Brooks, (Ed.), Teacher induction: A new beginning. Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Hodgkinson, H.L. (1985). All one system: Demographics of education, kindergarten through graduate school. Institute for Educational Leadership.

Hoffman, J.V., Edwards, S.A., O'Neal, S. Barnes, S. & Paulissen, M. (1986). A study of state-mandated beginning teacher programs. Journal of Teacher Education, 37(1), 16-21.

Holmes Group. (1986), Tomorrow's teachers: A report of The Holmes Group. East Lansing, Michigan: The Holmes Group.

Houston, W.R., & Felder, B. (1983). Break horses, not teachers. Phi Delta Kappan, 63(7), 457-460.

Huling-Austin, L. (1986). What can and cannot reasonably be expected from teacher induction programs. Journal of Teacher Education. 30(1), 2-5.

Huling-Austin, L. (1990). Teacher induction programs and internships. In Houston, W.R. , Haberman, M., & Sikula, J. Handbook of research on teacher education. New York: Macmillan.

Johnson, S.M. (1986). Incentives for teachers: What motivates, what matters? Educational Administration Quarterly, 22(3).

Joyce, B. & Cliff, R. (1984). The Pheonix agenda: Essential reform in teacher education. Educational Researcher, 13(4), 5-18.

Joyce, B. & Showers, (1988). Student achievement through staff development. White Plains, New Jersey: Longman.

Lambert, M. (1991, March 17). Teachers' layoffs to hit hard. The Sacarmento Bee.

Lampert, M. (1985). How do teachers manage to teach? Perspective on problems in practice. Harvard Educational Review, 55(2), 178-194.

Levin, H.M. (1988). Economic trends shaping the future of teacher education. Paper prepared for the University of Wisconsin Steering Committee on Strategic Planning in Teacher Education. Racine, Wisconsin.

Lipsky, (1980). Street level bureaucracy. New York: Russell Sage.

Little, J.W. (1989). District policy choices and teachers' professional development opportunities. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 11(2), 165-179.

Lortie, D. (1975). School Teacher: A sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mark, J.H., & Anderson, B.D. (1985). Teacher survival rates in St. Louis, 1969-1982. American Educational Research Journal, 22(3), 413-421.

Mastain, R.K. (Ed.). (1988). The NASDTEC Manual. Sacramento, CA: National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification.

McLaughlin, M.W., Tabert, J., & Basicia, N. (1990). The contexts of teaching in secondary schools: Teachers' Realities. Columbia: Teachers College Press.

McLaughlin, M.W., Pfeifer, R.S., Owens, S.E., & Yee, S. (1986). Why teachers won't teach. Phi Delta Kappan, 67(6), 420-426.

Milstein, N.M. (Ed.). (1980). Schools, conflict, and change. New York: Teachers College Press.

Morey, A.I., & Murphy, D.S. (eds.). (1990). Designing programs for new teachers: The California experience. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Murphy, J.T. (1982). Progress and problems: The paradox of state reform. In A. Lieberman & M.W. McLaughlin (Eds.), Policy making in education. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

National Center for Research on Teacher Education. (1988). Teacher education and learning: A research agenda. Journal of Teacher Education. 39(6), 27-32.

Neuweiler, H. B. (1987). Teacher education policy in the states: 50 state survey of legislative and administrative actions. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. Washington, D.C.: Department of Education.

Odden, A. & Marsh, D. (1989). State education reform implementation: A framework for analysis. In J. Hannaway & R. Crowson, (Eds.), The politics of reforming school administration. New York: The Falmer Press.

Odell, S. (1986). Induction support of new teachers: A functional approach. Journal of Teacher Education. 39(6), 26-29.

Plank, D.N. & Adams, D. (1989). Death, taxes, and school reform: Education policy change in comparative perspective. Administrator's Notebook. 33(1).

Schlechty, P. & Vance, V. (1981). Do academically able teachers leave education? The North Carolina case. Phi Delta Kappan, 63(2), 106-112.

Schlechty, P. & Vance, V., (1983). Recruitment, selection, and retention: The shape of the teaching force. Elementary School Journal, 83(4), 469-487.

Shulman, L.S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. Educational Researcher, 15(2), 4-14.

Shulman, L.S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. Harvard Educational Review, 57, 1-22.

Swanson, P. (1968). A time to teach--and a time to learn: The beginning teacher. National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 52(330), 74-84.

Veenam, S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. Review of Educational Research, 54(2), 143-178.

Wagner, L.A. (1987). Mentoring teachers for staff development: California's approach. Thresholds in education, 13(3).

Wagner, L.A. (1990). Starting a career in the classroom: Emerging public policy issues in the support and assessment of new classroom teachers. In Bacharach, S. (Ed.), Education reform: Making sense of it all. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Ward, B.A. & Dianda, M. (1990). Year one report: The California New Teacher Project Independent Evaluation. Los Alamitos, CA: The Southwest Regional Educational Laboratory. (Draft)

Ward, B.A. & Tikunoff, W.J. (1989). Year two external study of new teacher retention projects. Los Alamitos, CA: The Southwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

Ward, B.A. & Van Broekheisen, D. (1991). Final report of the Inner City new teacher retention projects. Los Alamitos, CA: The Southwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

Wirt, F.M. & Kirst, M.W. (1989). The politics of education: Schools in conflict, 2nd ed. Berkeley: McCutchan.

Wise, A.E. (1990). Six steps to teacher professionalism. Educational Leadership, 47(7), 57-60.

Zeichner, K. (1979). Teacher induction practices in the United States and Great Britian. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin.

Zeichner, K. (1983). Alternative paradigms of teacher concern. Journal of Teacher Education. 34(3), 3-9.